BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

JESUS THE STUDENT

Submitted by

Orville Ray Cook

(A.B.,Southwestern,1925)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

1929

Incorrectly paged
No pages

Jesus, the Student.

Outline

JESUS the STUDENT.

Introduction.

The Jesus of History has for the most part through the ages been a figure of altogether supernatural significance. Scholars dared not touch the hem of his physical garment, because of the possibility of marring the purity of his being or perhaps hurting the quality of his deity. Of later years, however, we have come to look upon Jesus as our model who was tempted as we are tempted, and as a personality who developed naturally and normally into full-blown character. We have come to the conviction that such a development was necessary to a true understanding of the life of mankind--if Jesus did not develop in like manner, then we are at a loss for a model; if he did, then we have a most sublime challenge to courageous tasks. The greatest proof for this conviction that we can find is in the life and teachings of the Christ. As we see him against the background of orthodox Jewish life, as we see in his teachings the extensive understanding of human problems, and the profound sympathy for human personality, this conviction is simply a logical scientific conclusion.

Such a foundation for a religion makes it possible to ask a question in regard to its founder which no longer brings a feeling of sin to the questioner. To what

extent was the founder of the religion of Christianity a student? Was he well acquainted with the current literature and life of his day? Was his knowledge given by supernatural endowment at birth or at some divine occasion, or did he learn by hard work and practice, the lessons which he taught? When he was asked a question such as the rich young ruler proposed,[1] did he answer like a young enthusiast trying to entice many into the discipleship or was his answer that of a stable, profound man of experience? When he needed to use scripture to support his view did he simply open his mouth and let God fill it for him, or did he draw from the rich treasures of devotion gained in his youth and young manhood?

If Jesus did have to exert himself in order to get knowledge, how and where did he do it? These are some considerations which will interest us in the discussion of Jesus as a student. Our records are so scanty for the early part of his life, that is before he was thirty years of age, that we shall do a great deal of speculating--basing conclusions on the background of Jewish life and customs, upon what seems to be logical considerations, and upon the fruits of his life.

This subject can perhaps be best approached from two angles: Jesus the student of his environment and Jesus the student of the Scriptures. This is the manner of our procedure.

Jesus, the student of his environment.

A. Historical background.

Since Deborah sang of the victory of Jehovah with her tribesmen and women around the campfire,[2] and since Joshua called the Israelites together just before his death to recount the history of the exodus under the leadership of Jehovah--it[3] is impossible according to Jewish custom and training that Jesus should grow up without knowing and coming in touch with the history of his people and with the current events of his day.

It will perhaps serve us better to get an adequate background of his community, in order to understand the circumstances surrounding his advent and development. A brief resume of the events of the pre-Christian era gives us a sense of the atmosphere of the Jewish nation at the time of Jesus' birth. The events are cumulative in their effect. Beginning with the year 170 B. C., we note a century of Syro-Grecian domination of Palestine. It was in that year and again in 168 B. C. that Antiochus Epiphanes captured Jerusalem. Thwarted in his ambitions for expansion in Egypt by the Romans, he turned his energies to the Hellenization of Palestine. The nucleus of the Jews was so strongly nationalistic that they were not disposed to wear the Greek hat, exercise

in the Greek gymnasium or consent to any of the foreign customs; however, the priests of the Temple became apostates. The Jews were forbidden sabbath observance, feasts ordered by the Mosaic law, and the circumcision of children. The Jerusalem Temple was dedicated to Zeus Olympus. Pious countrymen faced martyrdom for their beliefs. In a little village called Modin, rebellion broke out under a family of priests called Hasmonians. Matthias and his five sons gave themselves to this cause. At his father's death, Judas, the Maccabee, took the leadership and carried on a guerilla warfare against the Syrians. In 166 B. C. more freedom was gained by victory over the army of forty thousand commanded by Ptolemy, Nicanor and Gorgias. Enough strength had been gained to rededicate the Temple in 165 B.C. Simon and Jonathan, brothers of Judas, carried Judah's victory beyond the Jordan.

After the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Jews fared better. Judas, the Maccabee, was slain in battle, but persecutions in general were on a smaller scale for a while. The high priesthood was handed in succession to Jonathan, Simon, and thence to Simon's son John Hyrcanus. Factions pervaded the whole of this period. The Assidaeans who were perhaps the forerunners of the Pharisees were first allied with Judas Maccabee until religious freedom was attained, then caring not for national freedom, they left his support. Now Hyrcanus invited

the Pharisees to a feast and asked advice in regard to his rule. Eleazer said that he thought Hyrcanus should spend his energy with religion and let national affairs alone. Angered because the Pharisees would not give stringent punishment to Eleazer, Hyrcanus left them and joined the rival party, the Sadducees, who were in sympathy with national freedom. The Jewish nation under Hyrcanus gained influence and prosperity.

A new king Alexander Jannaeus brother of Epiphanes became ruler. His two sons Aristobulus and Hyrcanus at enmity with each other, were the source of constant war in Judah. Under the new king, Antipater (Antipas) was head of the Idumaean army. The Romans were rising in strength, and one with vision could see the probable outcome, so Antipas chose to support the side of Rome. Aristobolus chose to be allied with the Parthians. Great Pompey began his first commands in the East in 66 B. C. and by the end of September 61 B. C. had triumphed at Rome. On making a visit to Syria, he went through Judah and chose between the two factions of Aristobolus and Hyrcanus. All life in the Judean province depended on the attitude of Rome. Pompey decided against Aristobulus. He took away the conquered cities of the Jews, required payment of ten thousand

talents to the Roman treasury and divided the territory into small districts.

For the next half century the family of Antipas ruled bitterly in Judah. Herod the Great was a man of enlightened ideas, but was a terrible tyrant and ferocious ruler. In 40 B. C. he attained the title of king, and in 37 B. C. captured Jerusalem putting all the members of the Sanhedrin to death save two. Though a Jew, Herod bent every energy to bring Roman civilization to Palestine. He adorned cities and temples to the honor of Caesar. A building plan resulted in a group of cities called Caesareas. Theatres and temples were erected; market places were established; Roman games were organized and attended; and the temple at Jerusalem was rebuilt.

This king who caused so much grief to the nationalistic, religion-loving people of Moses died in 5 B.C., leaving his kingdom to his three sons. Idumea, Judea, and Samaria were given to Archelaus. He was anxious to please the people so they would follow him rather than cry for annexation to Syria, which thing they had been doing. So he lowered the taxes and freed the prisoners. But when the Jews mourned publicly the loss of two men who had been burned because they stood so nobly for their religion, Archelaus was so vexed that

he resorted to force--killing three thousand citizens. This event brought the end of Hebrew patience; so in desperation it seemed that they had two alternatives--either they would lose their nation or their religion. Little did they realize how closely they were bound together. The decision was made in favor of saving their religion. The possible way of accomplishing this goal was to cry more loudly to Rome for Syrian annexation, so they sent fifty ambassadors who prostrated themselves before Caesar. So desperately despised was Archelaus that he was removed and his portion of the country came under the direct control of Rome.

The people of Galilee and Perea liked Antipas no less--simply because he was the agent of the Roman Government. Despite the physical benefits such as roads, safety, justice, and scientific taxation, the Jews were conscious of the loss of their rights and could thrive under no other circumstances than independence. As an offset to massacred feelings of the Jews, a great host of literature was written which contained the apocalyptic element giving courage and hope to the depressed people. They looked intently for the coming of a Messiah to deliver them. Zacharias prophesied of such an one in Luke 1:79. He shall be one"to shine upon them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death; to guide our

feet into the way of peace." In this atmosphere their intellectual, political and spiritual life was brightened. We find such literature of apocalyptic nature in Daniel and II Esdras.

Thus we note the atmosphere of the days when Jesus came to Judea. The feeling of the people was an accumulation of years and decades of catastrophes. It seems impossible that Jesus should not know these things. He had to deal with the political and religious life which grew out of the past events and out of divers attitudes toward the Roman government.

Political and Social Groups of Jesus' Time.

The Pharisees, as we have already noted above were perhaps formed to oppose the Hellenizing influence of Antiochus Epiphanes. Epiphanes wished to abolish all Jewish religion and thereby centralize his kingdom. The Pharisees were of good ancestry and might, as strict observers of the law, have been called Separatists. Their belief included: (1) one God, (2) free will--God retaining the power to predestine, (3) the resurrection, and (4) good and evil spirits. Pharisaism in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs was beautiful, but in Jesus' day it had become perverted making the obedience

to the detail of the law the sum total of righteousness. They were the conservers of Jewish integrity--the aristocracy of assumed righteousness. They are mentioned twelve times in Mark, thirty-one times in Matthew, twenty-eight times in Luke and nineteen times in John. In all probability Pharisaism of Jesus' day was not the religion of the countryside of Galilee, but more particularly of the cities. In Matthew 15:1,they came from Jerusalem to dispute with Jesus. Jesus, however learned nothing constructive from them --they managed always to be numbered on the counter side in so far as possible.

The Sadducees were contrary to the Pharisees but did not prove helpful to Jesus. They arose about the time of the Pharisees in the reign of the Maccabees. After religious freedom had been attained, they were desirous to gain political independence also. They had religious beliefs including a reverence for the law, but they cared not at all for its strictness. The resurrection to them was a fallacy. In a sense they might be likened in attitude to the modern Jewish financiers. The Sadducean ancestry was in the priestly families. In their temple duties, of course, they were confined to the vicinity of Jerusalem. The Sanhedrin was greatly influenced by them.

A group of religious devotees called Essenes in-

habited a section close to Jerusalem west of the Dead Sea. They were a type of farmer monks who practiced common property, bathed frequently, and wore white garments which were never discarded until worn out. This ascetic organization repudiated marriage for themselves but adopted children of others. They prayed before and after meals, rejected animal sacrifice, abstained from Temple worship, painfully observed the Sabbath, and had a high regard for angels. They thought they became contaminated by touching lower orders. In their beliefs sunlight and immortality received special reverence. A majority of their time was spent in good work and in healing. In some of the large cities they maintained a type of Friar's School. Here students learned to be truthful, chaste, obedient and to read the scriptures. Some like to think Jesus attended some of these schools and a few old scholars have written lives of Jesus in which they take this attitude. Bahrdt makes Jesus a sordid comedy.[3A] He says that the Essenes are responsible for the persuasion and training of Jesus, in which different individuals took an interest in his instruction and education. Venturini also relegates him to the realm of the Essenes.[3A] It may be a fact that Jesus had some of the same practices or even bor-

rowed a few ideas from them, but it is a vain imagination to say that they had educated Jesus. He did not desire his followers to withdraw from the world, but rather wished them to change it. Jesus was more spiritual and personal than the Essenes.

Closely associated with this group in its ascetic nature were the Nazarites who had their origin in early Old Testament times. They were men dedicated from birth, to the service of Jehovah. They drank no wine, cut neither their hair nor their beards, and remained celibate throughout life.

As the name Zealot suggests, so was a group of citizens very nationally minded. They were mostly impulsive Galileans who could no longer endure the rule of Rome and were on the warpath with the sword to get rid of the avenger. They had an urgent attachment for liberty. This type of person calls to mind Simon, the Zealot.

The Herod Dynasty supporters were called the Herodians. They were largely composed of Jews who rallied to the Roman standard. They were willing to accept Roman customs and life. They felt that the Herodian Dynasty was fulfilling national hopes. They appeared twice in Galilee according to our records; Mark 3:6,13 and Matthew 22:16. Their views differed greatly from those of Jesus.

In fact Jesus did not entirely agree with any religious or political group that existed in his day. As we see they were divers in opinions and aims, yet Jesus was unique in his own teaching using some good from many of the parties and rejecting that which did not appeal to him. However Wendt ventures the following suggestion. "There is a reason to believe that beside the Sadducean aristocrats, and the Pharisaic scribes... and besides the world-renouncing Essenes, there was at that time another circle among the Jewish people whose hearts were the abode of pious gratitude and trust, and of sincere obedience to the duties of faithfulness and love nourished by a simple and upright searching of the scriptures. Joseph and Mary were doubtless among this number."[4]

Nazareth, the Home of Jesus.

The next step in our study will not receive sympathy from those who believe Jesus to have been miraculously endowed by a heavenly father. We prefer to follow the development of the student life of Jesus in the light of a normal boy in a normal home attaining through hard work, study and experience. Probably Mary looked upon him as such. The Nazareth home was the typical home of his day. Some desire to picture it as a poverty

stricken abode, but I see no reason why we should construe it as such. It would not be logical that a home in poverty should give such idealistic and high type of training as it did. His teachings, if they came out of his experience, reflect a comfortable, happy home. In all probability the family was in moderate circumstances--neither in ease nor want. Such was the circumstance of most homes in the East. The brick or stone house of Joseph served as kitchen, workbench and bedroom with mats, cushions, earthenware vessels, and a chest for furniture. The housetop was the gathering place in the daytime. This home was in the village of Nazareth--one of the most inspiring spots for the education of a great teacher and leader.

Nazareth was on the southern edge of Galilee, a country which Enelow inspirationally describes. "It was a land of superb situation and enchanting scenery. It was full of hills and dales. From any lofty spot the eye could travel to the mountains round about,to the west, Mount Carmel dropping gently into the sea; farther away the mountains of Shechem and Gilboa and Tabor, with their wonderful historic associations. Through a gap between the hills of Shunem and Tabor, one saw the valley of Jordan and the high plains of Perea forming a straight line to the east. To the north there were the mountains of

Safed, and further on, Hermon, with the life of large cities teeming behind its peaks, while to the south stretched the hills of Judea, with the beauty of Jerusalem beyond."[5]

Nazareth, "the cradle of the kingdom of God"[6], and as Jerome said, "the flower of Galilee"[7], was just north of Aesdraelon in the basin of the southermost range of the Galillean mountains one thousand feet above the sea. It was in a rich fruitful country of grapes, olives and other fruits. Streams burst from the hills in contrast to the barren wastes of Judea. Jerusalem had become a place of outworn creeds and was so out of the way that the great roads of the Roman Empire did not go by it. Rather they followed the coast through the Phoenician country until they reached the plain of Aesdraelon whence they turned to pass through Damascus and the Decapolis cities. Nazareth was not on the main road but was nestled snugly in the hills just close by. If one climbed to the top of the range, he would see the Jerusalem road, the Egyptian road from Megiddo to Beth-shan, the road from Ptolmais to the sea of Galilee, and perhaps roads to the regions beyond the Jordan. So Nazareth was in close connection with the outer world and at the same time a reclusive city if one wished to make

it such. It seems very logical that Jesus, as a boy, made both uses of it. Not a bit was Jesus ignorant of the customs and life of the foreign peoples who came to his town or of the Roman soldiers who passed by his road. He was a boy with a normal boy's insight and observance.

Evidently Nazareth in Jesus' day, was a city of some 15,000 inhabitants with a cleanly discipline and city rule. A council of elders governed, who cared for the roads, streets, synagogues and other city property. Laws of property were strict; morals were highly supervised; and life was orderly and dignified. All of this was in the center of wealth and hospitality. G. A. Smith gives this description of the natural environment of the city. "The road which goes up from the bay of Carmel to Nazareth winds as among English glades, with open woods of oak and an abundance of flowers and grass. Often, indeed, as about Nazareth, the limestone breaks out not less bare and dusty than in Judea itself, but over the most of lower Galilee there is a profusion of bush, with scattered forest trees--holly, oad, maple, sycamore, baytree, myrtle, arbutus, sumac and others--and in the valleys, olive orchards and stretches of fat corn land."[8]

The very language which Jesus used betrays the nature training which he had. An observer he was. These are some of the words and illustrations of country in-

terests which he used: plowman, sower, reaper, tares, the ninety-nine sheep, foxes, buds, wolves,scorpions, farm, eststes, vineyards, corn land, shepherds, wild and tame animals, trees, fruits, flowers, country weddings, slaves, hired servants, pulling down barns to build bigger, dishonest and honest stewards, eagles, ravens, colts, dogs, swine, hens, camels, oxen, calves, goats, lilies, mustard plants, reeds, swollen streams, and barren wastes. On the domestic side of life we find: women grinding at the mill, salt, lamp on a stand, a light to find silver, mended and wornout wineskins, ovens heated with dried grass, children's bread, servant and master of the house, well of water, children in the street, idle men in the market place, disputes over inheritance, prison, synagogue, local court with judges, ten virgins, marriage procession, marriage garment, brilliantly lighted hall, and the fatted calf.

In the village of Nazareth the weddings, funerals, songs, dances, and laments were open to all. Thus, in this small city Jesus had a chance to get intimately acquainted with life.

Institutional Education.

The home life of Jesus was of a very devoted type. His parents may have been closely related to the conscientious Pharisees--at any rate Mary attended the religious services when she was not compelled to do so by

law.[9] According to the later teachings of Jesus we would be led to believe that Joseph was wise, just, considerate, loveable--a man who gave good gifts to his children. He probably took Jesus into confidence as most Oriental fathers did not do to their children. The mother and father began the training of the child along religious lines just as early as the little tot could talk and repeat the old scripture verses. Unlike most of the ancient peoples, the Jews ranked high in education. Josephus says, "Our principle care of all is this, to educate our children well; and we think it to be the most necessary business of our whole life to observe the laws that have been given us and to keep those rules of piety that have been delivered down to us.....The greatest part of mankind are so far from living according to their own laws, that they hardly know them.....But for our people, if anybody do but ask any one of them about our laws, he will more readily tell them all than he will tell his own name, and this in consequence of our having learned them immediately as soon as we became sensible of anything and of our having them, as it were, engraven on our souls."[10] In the earliest pronouncement of words the Jewish lad and lassie were taught to say: "Hear, O Israel: Jehovah our God is one Jehovah: and thou shalt love Jehovah, thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might".[11] The parchment at the doorpost containing the name of the

Most High was to be touched with the fingers by all comers and goers and the fingers were then touched to the lips. Such a custom together with private and united prayers and domestic rites would impress the child before synagogue days. "The sabbath meal, the kindling of the sabbath lamp, and the setting apart of a portion of the dough from the bread for the household--these are but instances with which every 'Taph' as he clung to his mother's skirts must have been familiar."[12] The mid-winter illumination, feasts and fasts were to make their impressions. Stories of the patriarchs, prophets, statesmen, warriors, poets, sages, kings, judges, wisemen and patriots were told at the mother's knee. Did Jesus have such training? If he was a normal boy in such a devout home it seems that these things must have transpired in the most natural and illuminating manner. To get the law from the father was a privilege such as getting it from Moses. The study of the law began with the Shema (creed),then the short sayings, then selections, and then psalms. There was a special text committed for the birthday. Forgetfulness and ignorance were abhorred, so the child was usually quite proficient in his studies.

At five or six years of age he was sent to the synagogue school. Every child of respectable parents attended such a school where he learned to read, write

and find a great desire for the scriptures. He learned there more of the obligations of the law, more of the deeds of Jewish history, and more of the principles of the religion of Israel.

Synagogues were founded in 586 B. C. because the people at a distance could not attend regularly upon worship at the Jerusalem Temple. It seems altogether likely that there was a synagogue at Nazareth as they were established where ten men were members. Luke 4:16 confirms the fact that Nazareth had such an institution. Probably no rabbis were in Nazareth but no doubt the school was there. We know that there was compulsory education in every town in the time of Joshua, son of Gamaliel (64-65 A. D.). So it would seem altogether likely that there was some opportunity for school in Jesus'day. His day was a new dispensation in the teaching of the law--there was the rabbi, the doctor, the teacher, the scribe, the elder, the reader, the lawyer, and the traditionalist. "The new system, superinduced upon the old one, constituted the most efficient organization of human training that the world has ever seen. Looking merely to strength and permanency of results, better educational material than lay at the hand of the Jewish teachers can neither be found nor imagined."[13] It appealed to every faculty of the soul at every period of its development.

The Pharisees ruled in the synagogue. It housed the Bible school on the sabbath and twice on week days, and a police court on the remaining week days. The Jews called the school "The House of the Book".[14] The ruler of the synagogue was responsible for maintaining order, for oversight of the building, and for selecting those to take part. Distinguished members sat on the front seats--the younger men behind the older. Men and women sat separate. A service was composed mainly of the law and its exposition, prayers, eulogies and blessings. Jesus was quite accustomed to the worship service and took part in it. "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the sabbath day and stood up to read."[15]

The chazzan or minister of the synagogue was the acting schoolmaster. He had a great deal of the responsibility of dealing with the children. The main aim of the school was to show sin in its repulsiveness. Every effort was taken to instruct in truthfulness and in the avoidance of indelicate thoughts. Up to ten years of age, the Bible was the sole text book. Instruction in the scriptures began with Leviticus and was followed by other parts of the Pentateuch, the Prophets, the Hagiographa, and the Talmud. After the Old Testament was

thoroughly studied the understanding of the Mishna or traditional law was pursued. This gave expositions of Mosaic precepts. If two men farmed the same field, how many corners for the poor should be left, and how long should they be allowed to remain standing? What was the truth in regard to sabbath laws, vows, prayers, etc? Such traditions composed thirty-six treatises. At fifteen a Jewish boy was admitted to the Talmud discussions and to the Rabbinical schools. In the reign of Herod the Great 37 B. C. to 4 B. C. there were two very important rabbis working on the exposition and interpretation of the Mosaic law. Jesus was probably familiar with their work. Hillel was very liberal in his thinking, while Shammai was orthodox. Each had his following dividing the people into two classes. Modern times in ecclesiastical thought very well illustrates conditions.

The synagogue also served as a library. Many people who could not afford copies of the law and the scriptures in their own homes borrowed them from the synagogue. The book of Enoch could be found there and often in the country synagogues single books which even the scribes and Pharisees frowned upon were found.

It seems probable that Jesus must have had the finest training. We shall discuss his knowledge and

interpretation of the scriptures in the second part of this work, however the attitude of high minded Jewish people would almost consciously compel his attendance at the synagogue school. This attitude is found in some of the extant maxims: "The people which knoweth not the law is accursed", "A town in which there is no school must perish", "Get thyself a teacher", "Make the study of the law thy special business", "The more teaching of the law, the more life; the more school, the more wisdom; the more counsel, the more reasonable action", "The ignorant man cannot be truly pious", "A bastard who knows the law takes precedence of a high priest if he be ignorant".[16]

Besides the various synagogues, there was the Temple which was of supreme dearness to the hearts of all devout Jews. Visits to the Temple were always an education to the children and youth. The Temple was rebuilt by Herod. It was almost completed in Jesus' day--a beautiful edifice of white stone quarried under the city and trimmed with gold. At a distance it appeared as a snow-capped mountain. In the collonades stood devout Jews from numerous countries in the postures and attitudes of prayer and worship. The big curtain swaying in the breeze gave an atmosphere of greatness and wonder. Sometimes seven hundred priests

at once marched leading the animals up to the altar for sacrifice. Worship was conducted daily in the Temple, but, of course, it was impossible for the Jews from a distance to get there very often. Some came only once during their life time, some once per year, and others three times per year. There were three feasts that males were supposed to attend: the feast of the Passover, the feast of Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles. Each of them would last at least seven days, so there was ample time for intercourse broadening one's life. Emissaries of the Sanhedrin would go through the land each year, delegates would collect the Temple tribute or tax, and each city of Galilee would send its quota of pilgrims to each feast. This circulation of life and thought was a constant stimulus to religion. Sometimes there were as many as two millions present at the Passover. Jesus, we know, had the privilege of going to Jerusalem on such occasions--probably he went many times as he seemed to be so well acquainted with the people and conditions. We remember that he, at twelve years, was very much interested in the church work, as he was talking to the elders and asking them questions. Jesus had been taught to revere the Temple. Religious thinking was his specialty. In the latter days of his

life he came down to Jerusalem for the Passover feast. He was able to go into the Temple and put a stop to the avaricious customs. It seems altogether probable that he became acquainted with these evils in the years of his youth when he came there to worship.

It is a hard problem to get much idea of the details of his rudimentary studies. Did he read? Did he write? We are told that he stood up in the synagogue to read. It would take only a glimpse at his use of the Old Testament to convince us of this even if we had no other authority. Reading was taught by giving the child a book and having him repeat the sentences until he knew them from memory. It is reasonable to believe Jesus could write, though there is nothing certain about it. Writing was more professional than reading as they needed it in the work of the government and business. We are told that Jesus wrote on the sand in connection with the stoning of the adultress.[17] Whether he really wrote words we do not know. Again in Matthew 5:18 there is an implication that he was acquainted with the Hebrew alphabet.

What language did Jesus speak? When he read from the scriptures--it was probably Hebrew. The synagogue provided an interpreter as the language of the Jews was Aramaic. The native speech of Jesus was the Syriac dialect. Greek was studied very little in Palestine

though there were two hundred years of chance for it. Greek culture was coupled with the raising of swine. A few Greek names are mentioned such as Peter and Didymus. It is possible that Jesus did speak Greek and knew Latin but not very probable

There can be little doubt,however, that he was influenced and broadened by coming in contact with Greek writings, culture and life. The thought of Philo was having quite an influence upon some of the Greeks and Jews. It combined Greek and Hebrew thought. It was transcendence carried to its logical conclusion. Philo's logos expounded the part of angels between the Infinite God and the short-lived individuals. Through the ascetic mortification of sense, one was supposed to approach nearer the Divine. He, by allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, enforced the transcendence-idea of God.

The ability of man in the East was not gauged so much by the schooling he had had as is the tendency in the modern day. "Whenever men live in immediate contact with nature, they also live in immediate contact with one another."[18] The Arab's tent is a kind of school always open where the well-bred meet. Such meeting often gives rise to literary movements. Despite the absence of regular schools, the Arab is often distinguished. Jesus may not have been in the Arab tents,

but life was such as to afford that type of an education. Palestine was a land of proverbs, psalms, and parables. The East lends itself to such in response to meditation. Jesus in his teachings and training made use of such forms of literature. He must have been very fond of meditation judging from his life. During his ministry he spent starry nights in prayer--is it not logical that he should have done such also in his youth?

Education from Experience.

This kind of training leads us directly into another phase of his life from which he attained great measures of values--experience. After we read of Jesus' doings and sayings, we are profoundly impressed by the fact that his words were not those of a young enthusiast but were words of wisdom which came from experience. He grew up with practical experience. "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."[19] Being one son of a large family and the oldest, a great deal of responsibility would have fallen on him. Jesus had four brothers--James, Joses, Judas and Simon, and at least two sisters.[20] The care of the younger children would naturally have fallen to him. The Jewish boy at twelve was supposed to be of age. Climate and social customs stimulated early development. At that age the Jewish boy must

have a trade for support. Tradition was that he should pursue the same trade as that of his father. Often boys of twelve or thirteen years were found in the army. Marriage was regularly contracted at the age of twelve years. An interesting speculation along this line is that of a little book edited by Ghandi telling of the experiences of Notovitch who spent a great deal of time in the monasteries of Tibet and Northern India trying to find some hidden sacred scriptures. The Mohammedans did not wish to show them because they were considered most sacred. Persistent efforts however, availed him the privilege of reading them. Here he found many sayings of Jesus which corresponded to the ones we have in the New Testament. Furthermore they said that the parents of Jesus wished him to marry at the age of thirteen at Nazareth. Jesus did not wish to do so, so he left home and went to India to study Buddhist scriptures--preaching the true religion as he travelled.[21] This story is only interesting and cannot be based on facts. Rather it would seem that Jesus had something else to do. As the name of Joseph is not mentioned after the twelve-year episode at Jerusalem, it is commonly supposed that the father died about that time[42] and that the responsibility of providing for the family rested on Jesus. During those years he lived the

simple life of a busy artisan or mechanic, that is, he was a skilled worker in wood, stone, and metal. In practically no trade would there have been finer opportunity for contact with the common people. Jesus was the one who could fix the walls and roofs of the houses and keep all appliances of the home or the business in order.

Shirley Jackson Case speculates on the fact that perhaps Jesus had connections with the city of Sephoris just five miles distant.[21A] It was, perhaps, the city which was set on the hill and could not be hid. It was second only to Jerusalem in commercial and military importance. When Jesus was between five and ten years of age, the city was burned and ten years later rebuilt. Herod Antipas made it "the ornament of all Galilee".[22] Now Jesus may have helped rebuild the destroyed city since it was only an hour's distance. In these formative years there must have been a great deal of mingling with people in the carpenter shop, in the village, and in the city, for he understood character and conduct so well.

How did Jesus know of the hate that existed between man and man; of the stretching of the truth to meet a situation; of unwieldy passions; of the thoughts of men's minds; of the sex irregularity of men's hab-

its; of men's lack of prayer; of the futility of grudges; of gross errors; of snap judgements, etc? It is quite logical to guess that he had dealt man with man enough that he knew human life. After observing things as they were he looked at them in the light of the Jewish scriptures and brooded over them trying to make religion a personal thing of experience rather than an organized ecclesiasticism. In settling all important questions we must believe that Jesus talked to his Father about them and tried to learn his mind. He found that mind so well that he was able to reveal it to us.

Not only did he know experience from the outside, but he knew it from within. Perhaps there was no more pertinent experience before his death and resurrection than the temptations which settled his destiny. A new and potential decision had been made by Jesus at the Jordan. It was of such importance that a great many propositions were coming forth requiring answers. Since he had determined to introduce a new kingdom and interpret the father, he naturally had to make plans. Would he do it as the Pharisees expected? Would he do it as the Zealots hoped? When should he begin? How should he begin? What part should signs play, etc? These were some of the questions that Jesus answered in the Temptation experience.

Because Jesus was a student and a vital thinker he

realized the foolishness of fanatical guesswork as well as untried and weak principles of living. If he were to be successful in the father's mission, he had to know the father's will. All through the years he had studied the Jewish scriptures, and watched human nature. He had been learning the character of God so that at temptation time he had a background upon which to build the decisions of strenuous questions. He went to a quiet place to consider the different viewpoints of the world and to make yet more preparation and decision. He had definitely to figure out his relationship to the Kingdom in so far as possible.

The mind of Jesus in the temptation cannot be entirely known. He definitely designated his contention with the empire of Satan as a personal one. There was seemingly only one person with him on the occasion, and that was God. It is being alone with God that makes a prophet. Jesus knew his father had a great secret to give to mankind and he was determined to do his utmost to reveal that secret as God wanted it given. The only way we have of knowing Jesus' personal experience in this matter is by the talks he evidently had with his disciples. They were most intimate with him and could understand best.

We must not in any sense look upon this experience as physical. Jesus did not take a human devil with him--he did not take any kind of a devil with him. As soon

as Jesus realized that it was the devil, the devil had to leave. Jesus was neither led nor wooed by devils. Purity, love, and unselfishness do not mix with unchastity, hate, and pride. Oil and water may be thrown together but they repel each other. Surely Jesus was not taken to a pinnacle in reality--where was the pinnacle in the desert? He was not shown the kingdoms geographically--from what place could they be seen? Most probably the devil did not ask Jesus to make stones into bread. Jesus was having a battle with outward moral evil. By nature they were antagonistic. The Master in his story simply told his disciples in figurative, pictorial language the testing he had experienced in his spiritual life. The desert was supposed to be the abode of devils, and he considered the devil the possible wrong decision that would ruin the Kingdom. His friends understood his natural way of speaking. He spoke other times in parables--why be unnatural in this? No doubt he had local pictures in his mind when he chose the picture he gave the disciples. But the Kingdom experience was spiritual rather than physical.

Jesus was tempted and became an example in that he yielded not. He was not a man of sin, so he

could not be tempted from that standpoint. However, he was capable of sin. He resisted and thereby became stronger. It was not necessary for him to sin to be our example. It is not through yielding and recovering that one becomes strong against temptation, but it is in constant and firm resistance to temptation that one builds strong fiber--as in the making of physical muscles.

The first of the testings was in the form of a thought about performing physical feats. No doubt the turning of stones into bread would have attracted multitudes. It could not be stopped with bread, it would be carried to clothes, furniture, property, money, national power, etc. This kind of a kingdom would have been a physical realm, somewhat of the nature of the kingdom many people desired. But Jesus was solving the problem--was there a relation between the stomach and character? Surely, food is important and it is Christian to give to the needy and to help the starving, but what after the stomach is full? It has to be filled daily. Is there not something more important? He had to fulfill a mission of revealing God to the world, and if he started making physical manifestations, he would never get any farther. There would be no limit to the length it could be carried, and yet it need not

advance the Kingdom at all. He could never reveal God as being first interested in physical attainments to the exclusion of the spiritual. Jesus' answer to the first temptation was a result of his experience in Galilee. He had been discovering God all the youthful years of his life and he knew that God could and would be much more than bread and butter to the lives of men. As Jesus understood God, the father had never willed to champion such ideas as the spirit placed before him in regard to the physical realm. Unless the spirit is alive in man, he can hardly be said to live in reality--"Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God".[27]

In the second place Jesus was met with the problem of presenting the Kingdom. Should he perform miracles? This would undoubtedly have satisfied the Jews in many respects. But if he had thrown himself down from the Temple as the devil suggested, what would it have proved? Nothing for character building. He would simply have proved that he could jump temples. If he had started such feats, the people would have watched admiringly for a while and would then have begun agitation for another exhibition of achievement. The Jews were continually asking for a sign--but Jesus thought the proof of deity was not in miracles but in goodness of character.

If Jesus had jumped from the Temple, we do not know whether God would have spared him or not--it was not God's will that he should have jumped. He would then probably have been known in later times as a magician. God did not save Jesus from the cross--why should he have saved him from fate at the jumping from the pinnacle? Jesus decided that jumping would have taken an unfair advantage of God--not trusting, but crowding him into a corner and forcing help. Religion is more of a trusting relationship. Jesus would have been willing to face peril at his father's will but not otherwise. He had learned a great deal about the character of God. Miracles then according to Jesus' contentions did not promote faith. Man's freedom is destroyed if he is shocked so that he comes into an unusual belief by an unexpected happening. When the first impression of the unusual has passed away, then there is nothing left in the mind but question.

The third test was an inclusive one and a pictorial one of course. Jesus was not literally offered the world by the devil, but he realized that it did not belong to the father as there was so much sin in it. This was followed by the conviction that it ought to be brought to righteousness. How should he accomplish this task? Would the spiritual idea work--was it practical? The dev- said that it was no good and that the kingdom could not

be accomplished in that manner. Suggestions of compromise came to him--perhaps he might do and say somethings which were a bit hazy as to their spiritual import, or he might ally himself with an organization of that nature. He might go into partnership with an untried spirit and take a chance. He might choose according to his idea rather than according to God's plans. These suggestions no doubt looked very fine at first, until he examined them and found that at the center they were superficial-then he said, "Get thee behind me Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve."[28] Often people are asked to become partners of the devil when what they wish to accomplish is a great goal and looks impossible. Jesus decided that any kind of a short-cut did not yield true returns. He came to the conclusion that it was impossible to serve more than one master. No matter how hard one tries to be loyal to two opposing principles he ruins his own character and the world he lives in. Jesus realized that he was in partnership with his father and that everything he did must fit into the one great plan. He and his father were one. Jesus never stopped thinking until he came to a definite conclusion--one upon which he felt he could build permanently.

The tempter left. We have an idea that Jesus was tempted many times after this--remembering that he lived a normal life, but this particular series of tests were so important in the planning of his work. With the overcoming of these, the foundation had been laid for his future work. The abundant life was possible in the conquering of temptation. It was then that his life fitted into full harmony with the plans and life of the Giver.

We have spent a great deal of time with the Temptation because it reveals so much of the student life of Jesus. We have seen the inner processes at work.

Jesus was also a man who kept abreast of the times and was able to put meaning into events. We read that he knew of the embassy sent after Archelaus (Luke 19:12); the mode of capital punishment dealt to the Zealots by the Romans (Mark 9:42); the high handed acts of Pilate (Luke 13:4); the tragedy in Siloam (Luke 13:4); the inner life of the Pharisees (Matthew 23); and the crucifixion etiquette (Mark 8: 34). Jesus had thought and had come to conclusions in regard to the Jewish relations to Rome (Mark 12:16-17). After reading the meaning of events as they transpired, he was able through his intuitive intellect to reach conclusions--such as the destruction of the Temple. He was interested in and loved the nation, but saw

higher purposes for it than the people saw. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not!"[23]

Personality became a doctrine with Jesus because he had come to the conclusion that the highest purpose was to make character. He had lived so close to God that he knew His character better than others. The Kingdom of Heaven was to be of his Father because there was attributed to God the best and finest interpretation of fatherhood that could be found. To a father, personality of his children would be of the greatest value. God's son came that there might be life--life in its deepest sense. Jesus understood his father and his relation to men. The Pharisees did not agree with the Master on this point, since they deified the law. Jesus was forever referring to and practicing love for it was the one and great herald for personality. In the episodes of Jesus' life we note the priority of the individual: Zaccheus, Nicodemus, the woman taken in adultery, the plucking of corn on the sabbath and the emphasis of his answer, the rich young ruler, and the sinful woman's anointing. The parables he used in teaching had the same emphasis.

Common sense was a good measuring-stick for all occasions in Jesus' thought. Yet it was and is a standard so often set aside by others. It has always been difficult to get people to see that God works in a normal way. Jesus was an artist in the use of common sense. He must have found it a good principle to follow in all transactions. People used common sense in regard to the weather, crops, and business; the religious genius wondered why they did not use it in religion also. This key to life is quite appropos to the present age. Robert Keable in an article in the Atlantic Monthly[24] urges that Jesus was ignorant--with this I cannot agree--but in his further comments there is truth. "It was, apparently, this superiority and clarity of mind which provoked the hostility of every vested interest and authority in Christ's day."[24] It was his common sense which was outstanding. After all, it takes a smart man with a variety of experience to use common sense in all of life.

In Jesus we have found wisdom and understanding. We are told that "he went round about the villages teaching".[25] He had become a special student in religion and was teaching it in a positive method, as he always did. The great aim of the teaching was to get folk to experience God. Jesus had a mystical experience which was beyond any power to explain--the great effect of his life was made possible by the linkage of

the facts that he was a great student and a mystic at heart. "The genius of Jesus was for mysticism, and his mysticism was of the inner life of the Spirit."[26] This gave a balance of life which is always admirable and in demand for the building of the Kingdom of God.

Jesus, the Student of the Scriptures.

Jesus' use of the Scriptures.

A few intimations and illustrations of the preceeding pages would lead us to believe that Jesus was very well acquainted with the Old Testament scriptures. The fact of the matter is that he probably read very little other than the scriptures. We have traces of a few books in his sayings which lead us to believe that he read some of the books which ranked with our present Old Testament, but which in the process of canonization were omitted. We know that the Old Testament did not attain its final form until 90 A. D. A group of the alienated books would include Enoch, the Esdras, Judith, Tobit, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees. For example, Jesus in Matthew 7:12 giving the Golden rule would reflect Tobit 4:15: Jesus in his weeping over Jerusalem may have been familiar with IIEsdras 1:30; and again, Jesus in Mark 11:25 teaching about prayer intimates Ecclesiasticus 28:2. There were two collections of the scriptures in use among the Jews--one was Palestinian of the first century B. C., and was in Hebrew, while the other was Alexandrian which was in Greek. Jesus

probably used the Hebrew version though we cannot be certain.

Jesus used the Old Testament in a very practical way--it was a part of him. Many times quotations were on the end of his tongue ready to meet a trying situation. Many of the quotations it is true are not exact as we are in the habit of saying, scientifically done, but we must remember that his was not a scientific age and furthermore he was not writing an essay. Few of us are as scientific in our informal life as in our formal activity.

Jesus did not use the Old Testament to secure credentials for himself, as many of his followers did, and in only one place did he approach this--Luke 4:16-21 we are told that he stood up to read in the synagogue, and he read from Isaiah 61:1-2. This was done in a devotional manner. The Old Testament to Jesus was to be used for devotional purposes and for teaching, as he went throughout Galilee instructing in the synagogues and in the open fields.

As one begins to read about Jesus' use of the Old Testament in the works of scholars, it is very evident that all do not think alike. They seem to disagree on the number of direct quotations and allusions which Jesus makes to his scriptures. The fact of the matter

seems to be that Jesus was so full of his Bible that it had become a part of him so much so that one cannot tell whether he is consciously using it or not. Many quotations would be direct if only a word or two were changed and many passages could be counted as allusions if one chose to make them so. However, we cannot find the mind of Jesus on the matter so we must judge as individuals in many cases. This accounts for the disagreement of scholars. Many inferences which some attribute to his use of the Old Testament seem absolutely foreign in the author's opinion. There is one thing upon which all seem to agree--Jesus was a great enthusiast for the Old Bible. The Jews make certain that he got most of his teaching from the Old Testament or that it was preceded by the Rabbinical doctrines. We will gladly conceed to Jesus a large use of the Old Testament, remembering always that he put into it a new and vital life with fuller meaning.

I have made a study of Jesus' use of the Old Testament which makes possible the following tables. The first deals with the words which Jesus gave in direct or indirect quotation. Usually most of the words are the same so that both very easily fit into a class by themselves for our purposes. The second table is a summary of the allusions which the Master makes to

Old Testament passage. Some of these are incidents and others are phrases or clauses. Of these it is very much harder to be certain than of the ones in the previous table.

Table I

Matthew 4:4	.....Deuteronomy 8:3	Direct
Luke 4:4 * (see footnote).		Direct
Matthew 4:7	.....Deuteronomy 6:16	Direct
Luke 4:12*		Direct
Matthew 4:10	.....Deuteronomy 6:13	Direct
Luke 4:8*		Direct
Matthew 5:5	.....Psalms 37:11	Indirect
Matthew 5:21	-------Ex. 20:13; Deut. 5:7.	Direct.
Matt 5:27	.....Ex. 20:14; Deut. 5:18	Direct.
Matthew 19:18*		Direct
Mark 10:19*		Direct
Luke 18:20*		Direct
Matthew 5:31	.....Deuteronomy 24:1	Indirect
Matthew 5:38	.....Lev. 24:20; Ex. 21:24.	Direct.
Matthew 9:13	.....Hosea 6:6	Direct.
Matthew 12:7*		direct.
Matthew 13:14,15	...Isa.6:9,10; Ezek.12:2; Jer.5:21.	Indirect
Mark 4:12*		Indirect.
Mark 8:18*		Indirect.
Luke 8:10*		Indirect
John 9:39*		Indirect
John 12:40*		Indirect.

Matthew 15:4a.....Ex. 20:12; Deut. 5:16.	Direct.
Matthew 19:19*	Direct
Mark 7:10a*	Direct
Mark 10:19*	Direct
Luke 18:20*	Direct
Matthew 15:4b.....Ex. 21:17	Indirect
Mark 7:10b*	Indirect
Matthew 15:8,9.....Isaiah 21:17	Indirect
Mark 7:6,7*	Indirect.
Matthew 16:27ff.....Prov. 24:12; Ps. 62;12.	Direct.
Matthew 19:4.....Gen. 1:27; 5:2.	Indirect
Mark 10:6*	Direct.
Matthew 19:18.....Ex.12-16	Direct.
Matthew 21:5.....Zech. 9:9	Direct
John 12:14,15*	Direct
Matthew 21:13.....Isa. 56:7; Jer. 7:11	Direct
Mark 11:17*	Direct
Luke 19:46*	Direct
Matthew 21:16.....Psalms 8:2	Indirect.
Matthew 21:42.....Psalms 118:22,23.	Direct.
Mark 12:10,11*	Direct
Luke 20:17*	Direct
Matthew 22:32.....Exodus 3:6,15.	Direct
Mark 12:26*	Direct
Matthew 22:37.....Deuteronomy 6:4,5	Indirect.
Mark 12:29,30*	Indirect.
Luke 10:27*	Indirect

Matthew 22:44.....Psalms 110:1	Indirect
Mark 12:36*	Indirect
Luke 20:42,43*	Indirect
Matthew 26:31.....Zech 13:7	Direct
Mark 14:27*	Direct
Matthew 27;46.....Psalms 22:1	Direct
Mark 15:34*	Direct
Mark 9:48.....Isa. 64:24	Direct
Luke 4:18,19.....Isaiah 61:1,2	Direct
Luke 22:37,.....Isaiah 53:12	Direct
John 6:31.....Psalms 78:24	Indirect
John 6:45.....Isaiah 54:13	Indirect
John 10:34.....Psalms 82:6	Direct
Matthew 5:35.....Psalms 48:2	Direct
Matthew 11:10.....Malachi 3:1	Direct
Mark 1:2*	Direct
Luke 1:76*	Direct
Mark 9:48.....Isaiah 66:24	Indirect
Mark 14:7.....Deuteronomy 15:11	Indirect
Matthew 10:35,36.....Micah 7:6	Indirect
Matthew 11:5.....Isaiah 35:5,6	Indirect
Luke 13:14.....Ex.20:9; Deut. 5:13	Indirect
Luike 13:15.....Psalms 118:26	Direct
Matt 11:29.....Jer. 6:16	Direct

The asterisk (*) means that those references may be parallelled in the Old Testament reference just above it.

The summary of Table I is as follows:

Isaiah	9	Zechariah	2
Deuteronomy	10	Micah	1
Psalms	11	Ezekiel	1
Exodus	8	Malachi	1
Genesis	3	Hosea	1
Jeremiah	3	Proverbs	1

Total 51 references.

Table II

Matthew 5:3.....Isaiah 29:19; 61:1; 62:2; Ps. 69:33.

Luke 6:20*

Matthew 5:4.....Isaiah 61:1-3

Luke 6:21*

Matthew 5:6.....Isaiah 55:1ff.

Luke 6:21*

Matthew 5:7.....Psalms 18:26;;Proverbs 11:17.

Matthew 5:8.....Psalms 24:3-5.

Matthew 5:9.....Psalms 72:3,4; 85:11.

Matthew 5:10.....Daniel 7:25-27.

Matthew 5:33.....Num. 30; Ex. 20:7; Lev. 19:12; Deut 23;21.

Matthew 19:18*

Matthew 5:43.....Leviticus 19:18.

Matthew 11:23.....Isaiah 14:13-15.

Luke 10:25*

Matthew 13:32.....Daniel 4:9

Mark 4:32*

Luke 8:19*

Matthew 18:16.....Deuteronomy 19:15

John 8:17*

Matthew 19:26.....Genesis 18:14.

Mark 10:27*

Luke 1:37*

Matthew 21:33.....Isaiah 5:1,2.

Mark 12:2*

Luke 20:9*

Matthew 24:15.....Daniel 9:27; 12;1; 8:10;Ecc. 12:2
Joel 4:16; 2:2.

Mark 13:14*

Luke 21:20*

Matthew 24:30.....Daniel 7:13.

Luke 22:69*

Mark 13:26*

Luke 21:27*

Matthew 26:64*

Mark 14:62*

Matthew 26:38.....Psalms 42:6

Mark 14:34*

Luke 12:53.....Micah 7:6

Luke 23:46.....Psalms 31:6

John 1:51.....Genesis 28:12.

John 7:38.....Isa. 5:11; 55:1; Prov. 18:4.

John 8:56.....Genesis 12:2,3; 17:7; 22:18.

John 12:27.....Psalms 43:5

John 13:18.....Psalms 41:9

John 15:25.....Psalms 69:4.

Matthew 5:35.....Isaiah 66:1.

Matthew 5:48.....Leviticus 19:2.

Mark 2:25.....I Samuel 21:6

Matthew 5:22.....Deuteronomy 16:18; IIChron 19:5ff.

Matthew 6:11.....Proverbs 30:8

Matthew 6:29.....I Kings 10:47.

Matthew 11:14.....Malachi 4:5.

Luke 5:14.....Leviticus 13:49.

Luke 17:26.....Genesis 7

Luke 17:28.....Gen. 19

Luke 20:37.....Exodus 3:6

Luke 23:30.....Hosea 10:8

Matthew 12:5.....Numbers 28:9,10.

Matthew 12:40.....Jonah 1:2

Matthew 23:35.....Zechariah 1:1.

Summary

Psalms	9	Numbers	2
Isaiah	7	Exodus	2
Genesis	5	Jonah	1
Daniel	4	Hosea	1
Leviticus	4	II Chronicles	1
Deuteronomy	3	I Samuel	1
Proverbs	3	Joel	1
Micah	1	Ecclesiastes	1
Zechariah	1	Malachi	1

Total 48 references.

The results of this work show us that Jesus quoted fifty-one times from the Old Testament which included thirteen of the thirty-nine books, seven of these being prophet . The prophets are accredited only eighteen of the fifty-one quotations. Twenty-one are selected from four books of the Penteteuch. More might have been found here if one had used duplicates. This serves to show, however, the power that the Penteteuch had over the Jewish youths. Psalms leads the other books by contributing eleven quotations and with the one from Proverbs we have twelve from the Poetic books. One astonishing thing about this study was the fact that I found no quotations as such from Daniel (the book which is usually thought of as having so much influence over Jesus.) No doubt it did have some influence as it was an outstanding book of that period. Most of Jesus' reference to Daniel, however, was in the form of allusion.

I would like to suggest that the prophets gave Jesus very much of courage and faith, especially did Deutero-Isaiah contribute. Many looked upon Jesus as another prophet. In many ways he was, and there must have been much inspiration to him in reading of the experiences of the prophets since his work was so closely akin to theirs. And Jesus' extensive use of the

Psalms would suggest that he favored them for devotional use. They sang the songs of anguish or joy made real in his heart.

The conclusions of Jesus' allusions to the Old Testament passages also give us some interesting information. In total there are forty-eight allusions made by Jesus to Old Testament passages. Of these, eight prophetic books, five books of the Pentateuch, three poetic books and two books of history are recorded, making a total of eighteen in all. Seventeen allusions are from the prophets, sixteen from the Pentateuch, thirteen from the poetical books and two from the historical books. In these estimates we note again the large place accorded to the Psalms and Isaiah. Daniel has a larger place than in the quotations but not so conspicuous a place as one might imagine.

One of the great uses Jesus made of the scriptures was to use them as a progressive mark for a new day. He defeated the Pharisees plans many times by using their own weapon--the scriptures. We note this to be the case in regard to divorce in Mark 10:2-9. Jesus refuted by referring to Genesis 1:27 and Genesis 2:23,24. Again in Mark 2:25, Jesus plucked ears of corn on the sabbath. The Pharisees questioned him and he replied that David, when he was hungry, according to scriptures, ate the showbread which was only lawful for the priests to eat. (I Sam. 21:6.)

This little study gave us approximately one hundred times in which Jesus used his Old Testament. We are aware of the few incidents and sayings of his life which are recorded for us. He may have ministered from one to three years and what we have recorded might have transpired in a few days. Vividly we see that Jesus was an ardent, faithful, and devoted student of the Old Testament Scriptures. In the next portion of the thesis, we shall get a better appreciation of Jesus and his scriptures. In interpretation and devotion we see him exhalted.

Jesus' Interpretation of the Scriptures.

Montefiore is bold enough to state, "Whatever is new in the teaching of Jesus is not true, and whatever is true is not new."[29] The Jewish critic clearly sees that Jesus obtained much of his knowledge from the Old Testament, and we have no dispute on this point, however, we do believe that Jesus superseded by far the interpretations of the Old Testament Scriptures given by those of old time.

Our Christ built his teachings upon a foundation--all universal institutions must be built upon a foundation--so we will agree in the case of Jesus, his foundation was the Old Testament scriptures. As far as we can find, he had practically no other literature to read

except the Apocrypha. Jesus was not a member of any of any of the political or social organizations of his day that we know, so it seems that he was to a large degree a self-made man. He had a unique experience of God. It will be interesting from this standpoint to discover his attitude toward the Old Testament, and his interpretation of it. We will pursue a study of Matthew 5:17-48 to try to get an answer to our problem, since that passage is the best, the most extensive and the most authentic example of Jesus' use of the Old Testament.

In the introduction to this passage Jesus affirmed that he had not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it. Just why did Jesus say such a thing? Under what circumstances was it uttered? What did he mean by fulfilling? Did he not go contrary to Mosaic Law and proclaim a new righteousness? This introduction has caused a great deal of trouble for some. It seems very likely that some of the Pharisees were accusing him of doing away with the old law and seeking to destroy it. Some believe that these verses are out of harmony here with the rest of the teaching. Is the new law to do away with the old law after it is put into effect? Perhaps Jesus meant to complete the Old Testament--to bring a culmination to the old law and a deeper understanding of it. Jesus meant to include all sorts of things which the Jews had no idea would fall under the

range of the law. There was no desire on the part of Jesus for abrogation--he wished to deepen the law so as to give a wider application than the scribes would give. The teachings of Jesus deepen and intensify the teachings of the law. He observed universally what had been before observed between limits. The boundaries between the moral and religious realm had been pushed apart. We find that there may be a great deal of difference of opinion in regard to Jesus and the law. There is one thing, however, that issues plainly in my opinion--that we cannot interpret Jesus' use of the law too literally. We must catch Christ's spirit and then observe his use of the law in practical example.

Jesus accorded a high respect to the scriptures. To him they were of God. They told him of God and God's people. In them were contained vital religious truths. Not all scripture was of the same value, so we find that he used only germs which probably meant much in his devotional life. Often he made defence of truth by using Old Testament passages or by using Old Testament words that had a peculiar ring. Bundy shows a fine appreciation of Jesus' use of the scriptures. He says that his approach to the religious literature was simple and sincere, lacking forced interpretations, warpings and elaborate exegeses. "There was no thought of reading self into the scriptures and then reading it out again. Jesus did not use the Old Testament to secure credentials

for his official position. Rather he was a devoted soul resorting to its literature of religion. He made the Old Testament his own in terms of experience. The old scriptures were nerve and fiber of his piety.[30] Jesus was interested in the God whom he found in the Old Testament. He worshipped God and not the scriptures. If the Master in his own experience found God greater than the Old Testament presented him, he did not hesitate to take the highest view. When he criticized the scriptures, the criticism was always one born of a deep experience of his father. He knew a source which was higher than a body of religious literature.

Jesus then, gave fresh interpretation to the laws governing the spiritual life, using what appealed to his spiritual and ethical sense. The common attitude of most Jews to the law was passive and conclusive. The Pharisees had been making void the core of the law by paying attention to ceremonial details only. Jesus came to identify himself with and to consummate the law. He subordinated the ritual to the moral or the principle. We must not picture Jesus as flying in the face of Moses and flouting the law. It was the method of interpretation toward which Jesus was hostile. The Pharisees were defeating God's purpose and turning a blessing into a burden. The observance of law was the end of Jewish religion, and in this consummation the real spirit was often left out. Jesus wished to put the law which had become an outward symbol into their

hearts. He wished to distinguish between the external and the temporal, the national and the universal, the letter and the spirit. Jesus accepted, not the detailed laws, but the principle underlying them. The Jewish law was simply a stage in the development of religion. Many of the old laws were rendered obsolete by his teaching, but he did not destroy them. Rather he lifted them by bringing to expression and fruition the principles underlying them. An institution bound in the right direction as the Mosaic law was bound in the goodness of God to reach consummation. Christ was that consummation. He was the spiritual realization of the Mosaic code. There was a permanent and spiritual element in it, which he preserved. In Jesus the negative law became positive; in him was fulfillment.

Now we see that Jesus meant to fulfill the law not in the sense of the imperfect form of the Old Testament, but in the perfect form. He worked for a qualitative renewal of it. Jesus judged the law from the standpoint of the ideal and the leading idea was identical with the Old Testament. He perceived that his kingdom was in fundamental harmony with the scriptures.

If a practical man wished to know how Jesus interpreted the scriptures he would read the accounts of the examples which Jesus gave. So now we will examine them to see if we have given the correct re-

lationship between Jesus and the Old Testament. It seems to me that we may accept the records as Matthew gives them to us in regard to the introduction, and in our dealing let us remember that Jesus often talked figuratively. May we be allowed to speculate as to why Jesus approached the subject under discussion? Surely he would not have brought it up in such a manner if there had been no opposition. Perhaps the schism with the Pharisees had been in progress some days and because he had superseded the old Mosaic law they accused him of being unorthodox. No doubt he had told them, "Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man; but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth the man."[31] He had been eating with Publicans and sinners and may have neglected some ceremonial duties. Now they decided to ostracize him and accuse him of blasphemy and of breaking the sacred Mosaic law. It had finally come to the place where Jesus was forced to say something against the strong opposition. So he told them not to come to a decision too quickly. It is much better to think a thing through to a conclusion before making a hard and fast decision. Religion should be progressive and should allow for growth in righteousness beyond obedience to mere precepts. He told

them by example that they should do inductive thinking which would make their righteousness far greater and higher than it then was in its static state. It is much better to take the principle or the spirit of the law and follow it to its logical conclusion than it is to obey mere details because Moses obeyed such a law a thousand years before. It is better to do the necessary uplifting acts to observe the law in spirit than to be so busy with trifling measures without meaning in order to keep detail.

As to the law being fulfilled, the idea of prediction is left in the background. Jesus filled the law full. The teacher was interested in what the command about killing and the command about adultery involved. If they meant no more than refraining from shooting a man or illegal sex intercourse, then, that type of interpretation would not make citizens fit for his new kingdom. Citizens of his kingdom had to possess a righteousness which surpassed the righteousness of the Scribes and the Pharisees. Jesus did not say that he had come to do no more than they had done--to observe rules and call it good, but he said that he had come to bring the law to its consummation.

"You have heard that it was said of old time, 'Thou shalt not kill', but I say unto you that every one that is angry with his brother shall be in danger

of the judgement."[32] The framework of contrast in this quotation may be Matthew's but the thought of fruition is plain. When one hates his brother, he is beginning to be a murderer. Hateful thoughts are the foundations of the crimes of murder. . If one hates, he is beginning to degrade the other man, to say nothing of his own life. Hate is like a hungry wolf by the body of a helpless man--it eats fast and ravenously. The Pharisees had not seen the implication of the commandment. What had they been doing to the collectors of the taxes, the sinners, the opposing political groups, etc? "Thou shalt not kill", involves a keepership of one's brother. It involves a conserving, a perfecting, and a saving of other's lives. It means feeding with a loving attitude, with kindness and with mercy. Jesus did not restrict them in their thinking; he simply opened the door to a new world in which they could apply this law. We must not feel today that we are restricted in our thinking by Jesus.

"Thou shalt not kill", O, Massachusetts dairyman, by keeping one hundred thirty-six tubercular cows for your milk supply. "Thou shalt not kill" O poultry dealer, by selling diseased fowls for the market. "Thou shalt not kill", O churchman, by fighting each other in the community, when the young folk want true religion. The killing of the body is bad, but beware of him who is able to kill the soul, also. "Thou shalt not kill",

O nation, who has gone mad over commercialism, for thereby you are destroying body and releasing the poisonous propaganda of hate to deaden the spirit. "Thou shalt not kill" O parent, by dulling the moral sense of your child in his training. The child is largely what you make him. One can apply the principles of Jesus almost without boundaries. He would make the teaching positive and say, "Love your enemies and you will not be bothered with murder". Because Jesus gave that type of teaching it has become universal.

Again we note his teaching to the Pharisees of the past and the present, "Ye have heard that it was said, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery', but I say unto you, that everyone that looketh after a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already in his heart".[33] There must be a great deal of evil thought before a person commits adultery. There must be bursts of unruly passion. There must be a habit of evil thinking. The climaxing act does not keep him or her from being an adulterer or an adultress. Beasts have no thought of relationship or care of moral standards--such is man when he lets vile thoughts have their way. Homes are not broken over night. The process is a thought process, or shall we say, a thought habit. The carpenter had, no doubt, been in crowds where one member had a "dirty"

story to show the trend of his thought. Blacksmith shops as well as grocery stores are attractive for loafers. Did Nazareth or Capernaum have "red light" districts? They would have been unusual cities if thay did not have some people with beastly controlled passions. Jesus knew man had to struggle to keep on top of himself . It took strength for him to be a man just the same as it takes strength for us to be men and women.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery", O taxi man,--but we can read his thoughts in his eyes as women go past. "Thou shalt not commit adultery", O man who makes a practice of attending the "sex movie". Why do you tease your passions if you want to be clean? Jesus would make the rule just as strong for men as for women. Why hold one a prisoner and give the other his freedom? Jesus would say, "Keep a pure heart and the worries and desires for committing adultery will vanish."

Jesus said to his accusers, "It was said also, 'Who-so-ever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement', but I say unto you, that everyone that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adultress; and who-so-ever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery".[34] Mark, however omits the "fornication" phrase. This, being the oldest source, is probably

correct. At any rate Jesus must have gone on record as giving no cause for divorce at some time. This is an example where Jesus was at issue with Moses, for Moses allowed divorce for one cause. Jesus looked upon marriage as a relationship of the highest character and as a very normal thing. He read farther and realized that if a man put one wife away--it would be because he had another he wished to marry. Too many cases in America cannot wait to ~~to~~ marry in compliance with the laws. Jesus would no doubt frown upon our daily newspaper stories. He believed that there was no sin which was not social in its effects. The one getting a divorce also puts the other party in a bad light, causing adultery. Jesus would teach a higher law in this case. Train love to respect others as much as self. People have no business marrying unless a respectalbe love is involved. The only permanent way to cure the disease is to root up the cause. In the ideal kingdom, divorce will care for itself. Jesus longs for the kind of men and the kind of women who will have no need for divorce. The man or woman who marries for money, prestige, popularity, or just because he or she has a chance, ought to take a second thought. A classical ideal of love might be found in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Browning.

Again, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, 'Thou shalt not forswear thyself"----, but I say unto you, Swear not at all".[35] Here Jesus protests against two standards of honesty. Why is it necessary to give oath to the truth? Only one way is right--tell the truth always. Why have a code of honesty for business and another for private life? Why not make truth, truth? Why not have some newspapers upon which we can depend for the truth? Why is it necessary to swear to the assessor by God that all the property has been recorded? If a man will lie to himself or others without an oath, his heart is not changed by the effect of an oath. How about sticking to the letter of the law to avoid condemnation? A great deal of doctrinal argument would fall under this case. We have something to do in refraining from acting lies, and keeping our promises. Jesus would uplift honor and thereby fulfill the law.

"Ye have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth', but I say unto you, resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also".[36] This law of the Old Testament was an attempt at justice--to give just deserts in punishment. The rule of the primitive man would allow the enemy no place at all. The Mosaic law rose above that. Then they began to beleive that the one who avenged to the last was worse than the

one avenged. The enemy should have to pay but not ruthlessly. Plain justice was the ideal. Now Jesus came with a higher superseding law. The first consideration is the person avenged. It does no good for a person to have his own way or even punish to the utmost, unless it helps in the building of character. Sometimes it may be necessary to turn one's cheek or go the second mile,--that is small import if one is doing good thereby. We must not interpret Jesus literally, for if we do , we shall be compelled to say that he did not practice what he preached. Jesus did not always give to those who asked of him. Neither did he refrain from resisting evil. Punishment of the child must be done with the good of the child in mind, rather than to satisfy the anger of the punisher. Prisons and reform schools should have as an ideal the good of the individual concerned. The helping of the wrong-doer is a character study. When the beggar asks, give consideration to the man, not to his stomach. When organizations ask of your church, give to them which will do the most for character building. Life should be full of discipline, all working for the good of the disciplined. Jesus was always after character rather than legislation. The aim of the Master was the fulfillment of a brotherly love.

The conclusion and summary in this part of the sermon on the law was in the loving of enemies. "Ye have heard that it was said,'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and

hate thine enemy', but I say unto you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you".[37] We find no Old Testament law allowing the hating of enemies. However, Jesus probably got it by implication. The Jew's neighbor was another Jew--all others were his enemies. Those who hate enemies are like children, and a Christian as a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ should grow up. John, after Jesus' time, made it to the point when he said, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar:for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen."[38] Jesus was an idealist and this was his foundation. He was love and love fulfilled the law.

Thus we see Jesus and the law and why the Pharisees hated him. Jesus said that he had come to fulfill the law and the prophets. His conceptions were far beyond the law and even the prophets. His interpretation gave new luster. It may be that Jesus said very little that was new, but he gave a different and vital interpretation to that which was old. His interpretation was so strong because he so enthusiastically practiced it in his own life.

We have considered only a bit of scripture, but it gives a fair example of Jesus' interpretation. His attitude toward the entire book of scriptures was the same as toward the law. Scripture was valuable as it helped him to know and reveal God. His discriminating

mind made him unique and powerful. He was not against Judaism, but against its errors and perversions. We have inherited through Jesus a personality which belongs to the ages, past, present, and future, because he has revealed God and has aspired toward the making of character.

Conclusions.

The conclusions which we have reached in our study are quite evident. Jesus as a student had an unusual foresight, because he took an unusual way of thinking. The roots of his ideas penetrated to reality, where they were founded. From thence they blossomed into the Kingdom of God. The ground work was climaxed in the temptation experience where he settled kingdom ideals. From that foundation, a consistency of ideas grew as a mustard tree. It is remarkable to note that Jesus never took back a word he uttered. This surely required logical and careful meditative planning.

It was the same mind which evaluated personality at a glance. The Master saw much in the rich young ruler and suggested the cure for his dull life--but it seemed too great a sacrifice. Those who came to Jesus wishing to be disciples were scrutinized by him and given the needed answer for consideration. "The

foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head" and "Follow me and leave the dead bury their dead."[39] Jesus knew they had not counted the cost. On the other hand, personality never fell so low that he did not care. All had value in the sight of God--even the adultress. Jesus wanted to save personality as the greatest element of life.

Jesus got "next" to God's ways through his training and through reading the experiences of Old Testament characters--in fact he wanted to help God build a kingdom. He realized,however, that he must needs work by the plans the owner set forth. More than that, he knew that the only way to understand the plans was to get very well acquainted with the owner. We know that Jesus did this thing in a remarkable manner. The father was worthy of the highest ideals Jesus could find--in fact this mystic and his father worked out ideals together. God helped Jesus. Their kingdom was to allow no compromise with lower ideals. It was to have requirements for citizenship in this manner--Blessed are the pure in heart, the peacemakers, the poor in spirit, the merciful, the mourners, and they that hunger and thirst after righteousness.[40] If those who sought citizenship wished forgiveness--it was to

be obtained by forgiving others. These were queer rules for a kingdom, but they were built on experience and were proved true. The highest ideal that all followers must have was, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect".[41] This was to be a working hypothesis--a goal for all of life in the kingdom.

The wisdom that Jesus possessed was born of God; the experience he had was born of God--Jesus himself was born of God. Being born in so high and holy a manner even as we are born, Jesus could not have been satisfied with less than his best. For the best he prepared, for the best he studied, and for the best he attained. He learned so much that he has remained ahead of every age that has lived since he taught.

Was Jesus, then, a student? Did he gain his knowledge and personality by hard work? Which would be of more value to the sons of men--a miraculously attained knowledge or wisdom gained by natural processes? As we look at the environment of his childhood, we can but believe that he became a student of it--and later used it as a foundation for his teaching. Of course, the Jewish child would know the glorious, but terrible history of his race in its struggle for freedom and for God. Every one knew of the political and social groups and came in touch with them, but all did not become students of them as did Jesus; for he came into constant contact with the

Pharisees and Sadducees. Nazareth was an unequalled place for a student's retreat. It was quiet, enticing, common, possessing great natural beauty and was close to the busy avenues of trade. The devout Jewish home such as Joseph's and Mary's, gave him a stabalizing start on his way to be a student. At an early age, the synagogue strengthened and nurtured the desire to be a student, then the Temple inspired the education in the path toward Jehovah.

These early influences were consummated in terms of experience. Climaxing his student life was his keen mental and emotional activity in the temptation experience. None but a thoughtful and practical person could have been so successful in such an experience. This incident above all others shows the student-ship of his early days. His Old Testament which had become a part of him, together with his clear thinking mind, brought him through the temptation successfully.

There is no question but that Jesus was very well acquainted with the old scriptures. His student attainment is observed when he applied the scriptures to life. Jesus, more than any other teacher fathomed the deeper meaning of the words of Jehovah. Many institutions, habits, and attitudes, he found to be laid upon foundations which seemed unrelated until traced to their sources. This tracing, Jesus did. With these things in mind when reading the Gospels, we are forced to observe incidents on every hand that show the profound student life of the Master.

Summary.

Disregarding the traditional idea of Jesus' student life, which was based on the fear of detracting from his divinity, we approach our subject scientifically.

A brief resumé of the history of Palestine just preceding the time of Jesus gives a background for his intellectual development. During the Syro-Grecian domination the country was Hellenized. The Jews rebelled and to some extent regained freedom. Roman rule followed with members of the Herod family as local monarchs. Herod,the Great, carried on an extensive building program. It was a period of terror for the Jews, and great unrest was the result. The situation became so threatening under Herod Archelaus, that the country was placed under direct Roman rule. Jesus came to prominence at the critical time when his people, who loved their nation and religion so much, were dominated by a great world power.

Certain political and social groups, mainly outgrowths of the historical situation, played important parts among the Jewish people. The group with which Jesus probably had the most dealings, the Pharisees, was formed to oppose Hellenism and to strictly observe the law of Moses. The Sadducees were passive religionists organized for political independence. The Essenes were a pious and ascetic organization whose motto

was: Keep unspotted from the world. Some believe that Jesus attended their school. The Nazarites, Zealots, and Herodians were less important groups.

Jesus' home in the city of Nazareth was a happy one of moderate circumstances. The city in the hills afforded broadening opportunities as well as the beauty of solitude and nature.

The institutional education of our Master doubtless began in his home. The parental temperament was such that every opportunity for religious training would have been utilized. The Jewish home was a school for the teaching of the scriptures.

At five or six years of age, Jesus probably attended the synagogue school. The training there was broader and more intensive. Library privileges were offered.

The religious gatherings held at the Temple in Jerusalem centralized the life of the people. The annual feasts lasting a week or more gave opportunity for discussion and broadening observation. Jesus may have been in Jerusalem many times during boyhood and youth, besides the one time of which we are told.

It is difficult to draw any accurate conclusions concerning the technical training Jesus received. Probably he read Hebrew and spoke Aramaic. Greek philosophy may have influenced him a bit. Schooling for an Eastern man was not stressed as it has been in the West.

Perhaps a broader field of education for Jesus was that of experience, both outward and inward. Home responsibility must have taught him thrift, dependability, etc. As a skilled worker in wood, stone, and metal, Jesus must have had many dealings with others, perhaps in the important city of Sepphoris. Busy hands did not keep his alert mind from making his work a practical study in human nature.

For Jesus' inward experience we look to the record of the wilderness temptation. Upon it hinged his method of work, and the ideals which he forged. The thought life of Jesus is brought out so clearly in no other experience. The Master told his disciples in figurative language of the great mental struggle he had had. The temptation to turn stones into bread was a struggle between material and spiritual forces in his method of working for God's kingdom. The temptation of jumping from the Temple was the temptation to use the spectacular. At first thought, compromising with Satan seemed the easiest way to win the world for his father, but his better judgement changed this conclusion after he thought it through.

The breadth and depth of Jesus' entire experience made him master of the (1) knowledge of current events, (2) proper evaluation of personality, and (3) use of common sense.

The scriptures which Jesus had studied from babyhood became a part of his very self. Besides the books now in our Old Testament, it seems that he was familiar with the parallel uncanonized books. The author's study of the quotations from, and allusions to, the Old Testament used by Jesus in our gospels, resulted in tables showing that nearly one hundred times the old Bible was used. His favorite books were Isaiah and Psalms. Jesus often used the Pharisee's own weapon, the scriptures, to answer their critical questions.

In Jesus' interpretation of the scriptures, we find him exhalted. His attitude was always one of respect. Fulfillment meant reaching the goal toward which the law was striving. God always comes first in consideration. The law was only a step in the development of religion. Jesus' interpretation went far beyond the common conception of the law in his day. To murder or to commit adultery meant much more than simply shooting a man or having illegal sex relations. Hate and lust were the sins behind the deeds. One's standard of honesty for himself should be so high that oaths are unnecessary. The spirit of revenge is not the spirit for his followers to show. The love of enemies is the final test of the true follower of the law.

True education makes noble character. Jesus'

foresight for his plans, his understanding of personalities, and his ability to reveal God to man, made him the example for character for all ages.

The End.

References.

1. Matthew 19:16-22.

2. Judges 5.

3. Joshua 24:1-28.

3a. Berguer, Geo.--Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus.

4. Wendt, Hans--The Teachings of Jesus Vol I. p. 93.

5. Enelow, H. G.--A Jewish View of Jesus. p.33.

6. Renan, Ernest--Life of Jesus. p. 71.

7. Klausner, Joseph--Jesus of Nazareth. p.230.

8. Smith, G. A.--Historical Geography of the Holy Land. p. 419.

9. Luke 2:22,23.

10. Hinsdale, A. B. Jesus as a Teacher. pp. 34,35.

11. Deuteronomy 6:4.

12. Hinsdale, A. B.--Jesus as a Teacher. p.29.

13. Hinsdale, A. B.--Jesus as a Teacher. p.28.

14. Hinsdale. A' B.--Jesus as a Teacher. p. 15.

15. Luke 4:16.

16. Hinsdale, A. B.--Jesus as a Teacher. pp. 35, 36.

17. John 8:6.

18. Hinsdale, A. B.--Jesus as a Teacher . p. 20.

19. Luke 2:52.

20. Mark 6:3.

21. Notovitch--The Unknown Life of Jesus Christ.

21a. Case, S. J. A New Biography. Chap. III.

22. Booth, Henry, Kendall--The Background of the Bible. p.344

23. Luke 13:34.

24. Keable, J' --Atlantic Monthly, Dec. 1928."The Mind of the Master."

25. Mark 6:6.

26. Austin, Mary--A Small Town Man. p. 192.

27. Matthew 4:4

28. Matthew 4:10.

29. Montefiore, Claude--The Religious Teachings of Jesus. p. 8.

30. Bundy, Walter--The Religion of Jesus. pp.13-30.

31. Matthew 15:11

32. Matthew 5:21.

33. Matthew 5:27,28.

34. Matthew 5:31,32.

35. Matthew 5:33,34.

36. Matthew 5:38,39.

37. Matthew 5:43,44.

38. I John 4:20.

39. Matthew 8:20,22.

40. Matthew 5:3-9.

41. Matthew 5:48.

42. Barton--Jesus of Nazareth. p. 103.

Bibliography for Thesis.

Austin, Mary--A Small Town Man. Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1925. All the Book used.

Barton, George--Jesus of Nazara. Macmillan Co. New York. 1922. Ch. 7,8,14.

Berguer, George--Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus. Harcourt Brace and Company. New York, 1923. Ch. 3.

Booth, Henry Kendall--The Background of the Bible. Scribners, New York. 1928. Ch. 21 (part)

Bosworth, Edward. I--The Life and Teachings of Jesus. Macmillan, New York. 1924. Ch. 5.

Bundy, Walter--The Religion of Jesus. Bobbs Merrill Co. Indianapolis. 1928. pp. 13-38.

Case, Shirley, J.--A New Biography. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, Ill. 1928. Ch. 3,4.

Case, Shirley, J. --The Evolution of Christianity. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. 1914. Ch. 4.

Eakin, Frank--Getting Acquainted with The New Testament. Macmillan New York, 1927. Ch. 11.

Enelow, H. G. --A Jewish View of Jesus--Macmillan, New York. 1920. Ch. 1,2,3,4.

Friedlander, Gerald--The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount. Geo. Rutledge and Sons., Ltd. London, 1911. Ch. 1,2.

Foakes, Jackson--The Biblical History of the Hebrews to the Christian Era. Geo. Doran, New York, 1922. Ch. 15.

Gilbert, Geo. H--Jesus and His Bible. Macmillan 1926. New York. (all)

Gilbert, Geo. H--Student's Life of Jesus. Macmillan, New York, 1900. Ch. 3.

Gore, Chas. --The Sermon on the Mount. John Murray. London, 1897. Ch. 4

Hasting's Bible Dictionary--Vol II Scribner's. 1899. Article on Fulfillment.

Headlam, Arthus--Life and Teachings of Jesus Christ. Oxford University Press. London and New York. Ch. 2.

Hill, William--The Life of Christ. Fleming Revell Co. New York and London. 1917. Ch. 4.

Hinsdale, B. A.--Jesus as a Teacher. Christian Pub. Co. St. Louis. 1895. Ch. 2,3.

Holtzmann, Oscar--The Life of Jesus. Adam and Chas. Black, London. 1904. Trans. by. J. Bealby and M. Ca rmey. (all)

Horne--Jesus Our Standard. Abingdon Press , New York. 1918. Ch. 5.

Horne--Jesus the Master Teacher. Association Press. New York. 1920. Ch. 25.

Irvine, Alexander--The Carpenter and His Kingdom. Scribner's. New York. 1922. Ch. 2.

Kent. Chas.--The Life and Teachings of Jesus. Scribner's. New York. 1913. pp. 43-57.

Klausner, Joseph--Jesus of Nazareth. Macmillan. New York. 1925. Trans. by Herbert Danby. pp. 229-239.

MacFarland, Chas. S. Jesus and the Prophets. G. P. P tnam's Sons. New York. 1905. (all)

Montefiore, Claude--The Old Testament and After--Macmillan and Co. Lt. London. 1923.

Montefiore, Claude--The Religious Teachings of Jesus. Macmillan and Co. Ltd. London. 1910. Lecture 2.

Montefiore, Claude--The Synoptic Gospels. Vol I. Macmillan and Co. Ltd. London, 1927. Intro. pp. 117-121.

Notovitch--The Unknown Life of Jesus Christ.

Patterson-Smyth--A Peoples Life of Christ--Fleming Revell Co. New York. 1920. Ch.3.

Renan, Ernest--The Life of Jesus. Carleton Pub. Co. New York. 1895. Ch. 3.

Simkhovitch, Vladimir--Toward the Understanding of Jesus. Macmillan, New York. 1921. pp. 1-84.

Toy, Crawford--Jesus in the New Testament. S ribner's, New York. 1884. pp. 1-94.

Weiss, Bernard--Life of Christ. Vol I. Edinburgh. T.T. Clark. 1883. Trans. by Jno. W. Hope. Ch. 6.

Wendt, Hans--The Teaching of Jesus. Vols. I and II. T.T.Clark, Edinburgh. 1892. Vol. I. pp. 90-96., Vol. II pp. 7-29.